

Education Library

The College Board Review *file*

NUMBER 13

NEW YORK, N. Y.

FEBRUARY 1951

Fiftieth Anniversary Conference on Admission to American Colleges

[HELD IN NEW YORK CITY ON OCTOBER 25, 1950]

CHANGING RESPONSIBILITIES FOR
COLLEGE PREPARATION

AMERICAN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES,
CONTINUITY OR CROSS-PURPOSES

THE ADMISSIONS PROCESS—
BARRIER OR GATE?

COLLEGE ADMISSIONS—
PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS

RECEIVED

OCT 27

Harold W. Stoke

LIBRARIES

Francis L. Bacon

John W. Hallowell

Charles W. Cole

Also in this issue

COLLEGE HANDBOOK PUBLICATION POSTPONED UNTIL FALL 1951
SEVENTY COLLEGES TO USE MAY 21, 1951, ACCEPTANCE DATE

THE COLLEGE BOARD REVIEW

News and Research of the
College Entrance Examination Board

Published three times a year by the
College Entrance Examination Board
425 West 117th Street, New York 27, N. Y.

Director Frank H. Bowles

Secretary William C. Fels

College Handbook publication postponed until fall

The College Board has decided to defer publication of the 1951 *College Handbook* until the beginning of the 1951-1952 academic year. The later publication date was chosen to permit inclusion of any changes in terms of admission to the colleges which may be caused by defense manpower legislation.

Seventy colleges to use May 21 acceptance date

Seventy colleges have notified the Secretary of the Board that they will adhere to the May 21, 1951, Uniform Acceptance Date. Last year, when the date was May 22, sixty-two member colleges participated in the agreement.

The text of the agreement and the participating institutions follow:

The institutions listed below have, by common agreement, bound themselves not to require any candidate admitted as a freshman to give notice before May 21 of his decision to attend one of these institutions or to accept financial aid from it.

This policy has been agreed upon so that a candidate may be able to give consideration to all opportunities available to him. It should be emphasized, however, that whenever a student can reach a decision before this date, he may with propriety notify the institutions.

COLLEGES PARTICIPATING IN MAY 21 AGREEMENT

Adelphi College	Mills College
Bard College	Mount Holyoke College
Barnard College	Muhlenberg College
Beaver College	New Jersey College for Women
Bennington College	Occidental College
Boston University	Pembroke College in Brown University
Brown University	Pennsylvania College for Women
Bryn Mawr College	Pomona College
California Institute of Technology	Princeton University
The Catholic University of America	Providence College
Claremont Men's College	Radcliffe College
Coe College	Randolph-Macon Woman's College
College of Notre Dame of Maryland	Regis College
College of William and Mary	Russell Sage College
Columbia University	Rutgers University
Connecticut College	Scripps College
The Cooper Union	Simmons College
Cornell University	Skidmore College
Drew University	Smith College
Dunbarton College of Holy Cross	Stanford University*
Elmira College	Swarthmore College
Emmanuel College	Sweet Briar College
George Washington University	University of California
Gettysburg College	University of Chicago
Goucher College	University of Michigan
Harvard College	University of Pennsylvania
Haverford College	University of Rochester*
Hollins College	University of Virginia
Hood College	Vassar College
Knox College	Wagner College
Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart*	Washington and Lee University
Marymount College	Wellesley College
Marywood College	Wells College
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Western Reserve University
	Wheaton College
	Yale University

* Scholarship candidates not included.

Changing Responsibilities for College Preparation

Harold W. Stoke

Harold Walter Stoke was President of Louisiana State University from 1947 to 1950. For the three preceding years he was President of the University of New Hampshire. He has taught at Berea College and served as Dean of the Graduate Schools at the Universities of Nebraska and Wisconsin. A historian and political scientist, he is the author of The Foreign Relations of the Federal State and co-author of The Background of European Governments. During the war he served the government as consultant on matters of training and education and as Chief of the War Records Section of the Bureau of the Budget.

One of the surprising discoveries which colleges always make about the student who comes to them is how much education he has had before he arrives. No matter at what stage in school we find him the student always seems to know so much more than he was taught. He always seems to know things so different from those he was taught. The college student always carries on his forehead a sign, educationally speaking, "Kilroy was here."

The colleges naturally find that their own work is materially affected by what has gone before, both outside and inside the schools. Since we only gradually find out just what has already gone into the student's education, the problem is to make what we would like to do for him fit appropriately on to what has already been done. This fact is one of our major educational problems; it is also one of our best alibis. If only, we think, we had had him before someone else did; if we could have taught him before he had been spoiled by earlier blunderers. If our own work is ineffective, we can always point to the fact that the student's education before he reached us has relieved us of responsibility. We share this privilege with teachers at every level. I have

always been impressed with the following series of verses by an (to me) unknown author:

College Professor:

Such rawness in a pupil is a shame;
Lack of preparation in the high school is to blame.

High School Teacher:

Good heavens, what crudity; the boy's a fool!
The fault, of course, is in the grammar school.

Grammar School Teacher:

From such stupidity may I be spared;
They send them up to me so unprepared.

Primary Teacher:

Kindergarten blockhead! And they call
That preparation. Worse than none at all.

Kindergarten Teacher:

Such lack of training never did I see:
What kind of woman must the mother be!

The Mother:

Poor helpless child—he's not to blame;
His father's people are all just the same.

It seems to be generally agreed that the gap between the high schools and the colleges has widened. High schools are no longer primarily college preparatory institutions; their service is dominantly concerned with a noncollege-going group. The colleges are worried lest their prospective students will be treated at the secondary level as stepchildren. The strain has almost reached the point where the colleges seem unwilling or unable to rely upon the secondary schools for college preparation, and the secondary schools seem almost eager to relinquish the task.

In discussions of the relations between the

colleges and secondary schools, it has been customary for college people to start with an examination of the high schools and of how well or ill they fulfill their college preparatory work. I suggest that we reverse the inquiry. As a way of throwing light on the college entrant perhaps we should ask what today we, and our society generally, expect of the college graduate. If we can get some fairly clear idea of what we expect a student to become, we shall have a better estimate of the kind of equipment he needs.

THE MAN OF LEARNING

When we examine our expectation of the college graduate today, we are brought up short by the contrast with the expectation made of him a generation or two ago. Then the purpose of higher education was to produce what could with some accuracy be described as the "man of learning." The educated man was expected to know something of philosophy, history, mathematics, languages, including the classical languages, and religion. He used obscure allusions in his conversation and understood other people when they did the same. He knew something of the lives and achievements of great men. Literature, including even poetry, was a part of his equipment for thinking. In the classical words of President DeWitt Hyde of Bowdoin College, the educated man was expected "to be at home at all times and in all places, to count nature a familiar acquaintance and yet an intimate friend, to carry the keys to the world's library in one's pocket and feel its resources behind one in whatever task he undertakes."

Today "learning" as the hallmark of the educated man has faded badly. Americans may admire learning but they do not emulate it. If one may paraphrase President Hyde, the educated man today with the standard equipment of his two-door convertible expects "to be at home in all places in practically no time at all, to count nature a nuisance to be outwitted in the end, to carry the keys to the world's library in one's pocket to insure that no one will steal the books."

If I were to try to describe the product of

higher education today, it would not be with the phrase "the man of learning," but rather "the man of competence."

Albert Jay Nock, in his book, *The Theory of Education in the United States*, tells an incident which puts the contrast very clearly. "A few months ago (he relates) an Italian nobleman, one of the most accomplished men in Europe, told me he had a curious experience in our country. . . . He said he had been in America several times, and had met some very well-educated men, as an Italian would understand that term; but they were all in the neighborhood of sixty years old. Under that age, he said, he had happened to meet no one who impressed him as at all well-educated. . . . I told him that he had been observing the remnants of a pre-revolutionary product . . . that our educational system had been thoroughly reorganized both in spirit and in structure about 35 years ago. . . . 'But,' I went on, 'our younger men are really very keen; they are men of parts and our colleges and universities do a great deal for them. Just try to get around them on the merits of a bond issue or a motor car, the fine points of commercial ice-making or retail shoe merchandising or the problem of waste motion in brick-laying or in washing dishes for a hotel, and they will give a first-rate account of themselves. . . .' My friend replied that that wasn't quite what he had in mind when he spoke of education. 'Just so,' I replied, 'but it is very much what we have in mind. We are all for being practical in education.'"

COMPETENCE IS BECOMING GOAL

So I would say that competence, not learning, is becoming our educational goal. Our educated man can solve mathematical equations and thus adjust the streamlining of an automobile; he can write advertising slogans or use applied psychology to induce people to vote as he wishes. In short, he can "produce."

While it is customary to bemoan changes which run counter to one's personal preferences, I am not ready to decry *altogether* the drift away from learning to competence as an educa-

tionally desirable goal. Certainly, learning can be and at times has been arid soil and there are whole areas in our educational garden which still prove it. Modern educators are right when they demand that the exercise necessary for the development of minds and character be taken on something besides a treadmill. Yet the emphasis on competence also has its limitations. While it may provide for its possessor immediate utility and a feeling of personal confidence, a sense of mastery, it is inclined to be narrow and there is a temptation to selfishness as against tolerance and generosity. Education as competence is like the focus of a searchlight while education as learning is the lamp in the window visible from all directions.

OURS IS AN AGE OF POWER

If I were to attempt a philosophical explanation for our educational state of being, I would say that education is always dominated by the outstanding characteristic of the age in which it takes place and that ours is no exception. The world has had its Age of Reason or Religion or Art, and the educational interests of the day reflected that fact. Ours is an Age of Power, and our educational system like every other aspect of our life is profoundly affected by that fact. In this I find an adequate explanation of the shift from learning to competence as the desirable end of education, for both the foundations and uses of competence are power. Henry Adams prophesied fifty years ago: "The new American, the child of incalculable coal power, chemical power, electric power, and radiating energy as well as of new forces yet undetermined must be a sort of god compared with any former creation of nature. At the rate of progress since 1800 every American who lived into the year two thousand would know how to control unlimited power. To him the nineteenth century would stand on the same plane with the fourth—equally childlike—and he would wonder how both of them knowing so little and so weak in force should have done so much."

I need not elaborate to this audience the pre-

occupation of our generation with power, power of every kind. I have come to the conclusion that every phase of education these days which shows vitality or attraction is devoted in some way to the direct purpose of obtaining or managing power. The "power subjects" are in the ascendant; the "reflective subjects" in decline. New subjects have taken over and old subjects have been subtly transformed by the necessity of associating themselves with the problem of power. Take, for example, the plight of languages. Greek and Latin have all but gone the way of Hebrew. Modern languages are sustained almost entirely by their value as instruments of diplomacy or of commerce—their power coefficient is high, their cultural coefficient is low. Philosophy withers, while psychology, a "power subject" *par excellence*, with its insights into human action, flourishes. History today tends to be written as social comment, designed as nearly as its authors dare to affect the next election or the chances of a pet cause. The study of government has become "administration." If not quite devoted to the study of "how to win friends and influence people" administration is largely dominated by management concepts. I was struck during a period of government service a few years ago by the large number of employees who in their spare time were studying personnel administration. Even though they themselves might not want positions of personnel management in government service, they seemed to know instinctively that this was the subject related to the controls over their own lives. Economics has become business management and labor relations or the science of "how can we make someone else pay for this." The education of teachers has become less concerned with education and more nearly a program for establishing conditions of employment. The natural sciences reflect the same trend. In the subdivisions of biology it is the "power subjects"—entomology, plant pathology, bacteriology—which are vigorous while those of more purely intellectual interest grow weaker. The same is true of the physical sciences. In the field of English, speech

and journalism—communication, if you will—overshadow literature. One caustic critic has remarked that these subjects bear the same relation to the study of literature as sound does to sense. The new “power subjects” grow by leaps and bounds while the older subjects must adapt themselves to the educational climate or die.

It is against this background that we must discuss not only the matter of college preparatory but all of our educational work. The change from learning to competence in an age of power brings us some new values we can welcome just as it brings us losses we regret. Perhaps our best role is to fight rear guard actions, to give ground but give it grudgingly. It may be that in time some of the newer subjects will get over their bumptiousness and become more modest and aware of their own limitations. At any rate, all other educational values ought not to yield to the lure of power until we can be sure that that pearl of great price is not merely a gold brick.

COLLEGES WILL PREPARE OWN STUDENTS

From all this there would seem to be certain facts the colleges must face. Their own product has changed. The college graduate of today bears as little resemblance to the graduate of a former generation as the college entrant of today bears to the college entrant of that day. We cannot make ourselves believe that these differences are traceable merely to differences in college preparatory courses. They are due to more fundamental social changes reflected in our expectations of educated people. Yet, whether the educational ideal of the colleges is learning or competence, their students must still be adequately prepared. If the secondary schools, with their growing preoccupation with a noncollege-going population, do not supply it there must be some other recourse.

Several things are possible. The first requires that the colleges and universities face this fact: they themselves must assume more of the task of preparing their own students. A hundred years ago many a college had its own academy; the academy need not be revived but its work

must be taken over. This is already being done. A student may now begin the study of a language in college, or the study of mathematics or several other subjects. This trend will have to be extended to include English as well. Even subjects taught in college on the assumption of secondary school preparation are incorporating more and more review in their initial stages—probably a desirable practice in any event.

There are, for example, usually no less than four varieties of beginning chemistry taught in the universities—for those who have had chemistry, for those who have not had it, chemistry for home economics students or for engineers or others. The situation is about the same for mathematics or physics. Each course is a recognition that the preparation of the students is so diverse or their uses for the subject are so varied that the question of a prescribed college preparatory course becomes incidental and is lost in the shuffle. The universities and many colleges are equipped to teach a variety of subjects to the prepared or the unprepared.

Actually, to prepare their own students may not be for the colleges so alarming or burdensome as it sounds. Tests have shown that the speed of learning of students who have never previously studied a subject may at the college level actually be much greater than the speed of learning earlier. Nevertheless, the colleges are faced with the necessity either of reducing the level of demand of the subjects which they teach or of shoring up the basic preparation of their students. Perhaps the division of labor (not to be taken too seriously) hereafter will be this: The visual and oral pattern of education will be supplied by the elementary and secondary schools, the movies, radio, television, and the picture magazines; it will be the duty of the colleges to fill in the pattern with words.

MORE GENERAL EDUCATION

The second adjustment of the colleges and universities to the changed equipment of the college entrant will be to hurry the development in their curricula of more general education.

This general education, if I interpret it correctly, is the last redoubt of the curriculum of learning against specialized, target-shooting departments preoccupied with turning out majors and experts of competence. Not content with their ultimate absorption of the time and energy of the student, departments have organized a rash of pre-courses—premedical, pre-engineering, prelaw—aiming not only at the control of the student's specialized study but at his preparation even after he has reached college. Paradoxically, we shall have to make learning itself a limited, specialized curriculum which every student will be compelled to take early in his college career. As I see it, this remains the lone possibility of encompassing the diversity of our students into some sort of intellectual community. Once led captive into departmental provinces—a capture which the departments co-gently justify by merely pointing out the vast amount of specialized knowledge the student must learn—there is little hope of his ever joining again the community of scholars.

As a third adjustment, of course, we might try simultaneously a house cleaning of our cluttered college curricula and fractionated courses, but of that I have less hope.

The only considerations I have found to be in the slightest effective are not educational, but mechanical—such matters as budgets, enrollments, space, and staff.

All of this is meant to leave the impression that, although education may be more varied in activity and more vast in volume than ever before, it is being shaped at all levels by the same kinds of governing social and intellectual considerations. Education for our generation is becoming more of a piece than many of our discussions assume. The forces which have altered what the secondary schools are doing have altered just as effectively, though more in content than in form, what the colleges are doing. We can hardly prescribe a college preparatory course without inquiring about the work, the student, and the citizen for which it is a preparation. It is an appraisal of the whole we must undertake, an appraisal which must take account of the new interests, preoccupations, and compulsions of this age of power. It may be that when we have achieved some perspective, we shall find more to please than to dismay.

American Schools and Colleges, Continuity or Cross-Purposes

Francis L. Bacon

Francis L. Bacon, now Professor of Education at the University of California at Los Angeles, has at one time or another been Principal or Superintendent of high schools in Oklahoma, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Illinois. He has been President of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Chairman of the Educational Policies Commission of the Na-

tional Education Association, and Vice-Chairman of the American Council on Education.

The topic, "American Schools and Colleges, Continuity or Cross-Purposes," intrigues me into making an attempt to find the setting out of which an original continuity developed, and to see the cross-purposes which played against

this continuity; to note the changes in the settings themselves; and then finally to plead, if I may, for a new continuity to replace the old. Really, now, I have made my speech. The rest is just a fill-in.

I

The historic character of this anniversary meeting calls to mind the peculiar founding of secondary education in this country. We will not presume to play an historian's part. We intend, rather, to bring certain historical emphasis to bear that the long-time relationship between schools and colleges may be the better interpreted and understood.

The early colonists thought in terms of European education because no other knowledge was available, but, from the first, they sought eagerly to make this education a part of the common life. Although they did not at once succeed, their interest was strongly rooted and eventually was to make significant progress.

The first secondary school covered the long period of youth and was created partly from the English Latin grammar school and partly from the European arts college—a continuity which is now once again, oddly enough, considerably in evidence although carrying new nomenclature and modern trappings.

The university did not develop at once in America, and the college, by accident rather than by design, became something of a hybrid between the secondary school and the university. This happening brought to the college a distinctive peculiarity, as an institution, and bequeathed to it an obligation to maintain a sequence in the classical remainders of the seven liberal arts.

Thus, too, it developed that the Latin grammar school was to be a preparatory school with an obligation to start the classical sequence and to prepare students for the arts college. For more than 200 years the close continuity of secondary and higher education, in purpose and achievement, gave power and prestige to education in the new America. That any other form of school-

ing would have served the time and place so well is open to serious doubt.

The record tells us that the leaders in the making of the Revolution and in the building of the Republic were products of the education which we have briefly described.

Against these great contributions of early American education must be thrown the fact of an expanding life that began even before the Revolution, and which received tremendous impetus immediately thereafter. The growth of trade, shipping, business, small manufacturing, and agriculture became so important by 1750 that new and different forms of education were proposed. Discerning leaders, not schoolmasters, saw that the continuity of grammar school and arts college could no longer offer an educational promise commensurate to the promises suggested by other newly developing phases of American life. The American genius for growth and adaptation had begun to fabricate its remarkable story of achievement, and education could not long rest in isolation.

SCHOOL FOR COMMON MAN

Although the establishment of compulsory schooling and tax support by the early colonists was somewhat unique and certainly the beginning of the peculiarly American educational development, the fact remained that education was aristocratic in character, an experience for the few rather than for the many. Despite the role of the commoner in the Revolution, colonial education, as formally organized, was essentially for gentlemen, and for the boys, not for the girls. It was to retain for many years its European antecedents of religious and ornamental domination rather than utilitarian applications then so greatly desired by the new Republic.

Benjamin Franklin's great vision of a new school for the common man was the first brilliant indication of protest and cross-purpose between secondary school and college.

In the 100 years that followed, the Latin grammar school disappeared and, by 1850, there were more than 6,000 academies which reached,

although somewhat feebly, toward Franklin's new academy with its amazing "Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Pennsylvania."

By the turn of the nineteenth century, the American people began increasingly to indicate that a continuity in secondary education and college which perpetuated a concept of intellectual aristocracy as the chief end of American education was not, in their judgment, in tune with the spirit and purpose of the developing Republic.

American invention in the fields of culture and education developed more slowly than in other phases of American life. The people themselves have had more to do with the evolving character of education in this country than have the professional educators. It was in such mood that public reaction fashioned by 1900 a new protest against the old European continuity and brought into being the unique idea of the people's secondary school.

By the time that the lower schools had been organized into a graded elementary system, the public high school and the academy had already become distinct and separate units and were considerably at cross-purposes with both the colleges and the lower schools. The old continuity was beginning to break.

It was this confused situation which, in the latter half of the century, indicated so emphatically the need for a cooperative endeavor or solution. This was the setting which inspired the creation of the organization whose anniversary was so happily celebrated last evening.

II

The first important educational committees, as the Committee of Ten, 1893, and the Committee on College Entrance Requirements, 1899, did much to bring order out of confusion and to indicate directions toward which education should go, but these committees also contributed unwittingly, it seems, to a concept of secondary education devoted almost exclusively to

college preparation in the continuity of the arts tradition.

Meanwhile, against this educational setting of 1900, let us say, American life was to cast the most profound and amazing changes—changes which again repeated something of the pattern of the eighteenth century in cross-purposes between social growth and the status of education.

In 1899, one-third of the boys and girls of high school age were in high school. Today, the percentage is nearly three-fourths. In a fifty-year period, the American secondary school has increased in enrollment about 3,900 per cent. In 1899, about 25 per cent of those who entered high schools were graduated, whereas today it is about 60 per cent. In 1899, it was, for the most part, the more capable sons of the professional and managerial or proprietary groups who were graduated from high school. Today, all occupations are generously represented among high school graduates. The same selective factors obviously operated more definitely on the college campus.

COLLEGE ENROLLMENT

On college enrollment, it is interesting to quote from *A Handbook of Requirements for Admission to Colleges*, by A. F. Nightingale, published in 1879. In his table of enrollment, Mr. Nightingale designates "colleges, admitting gentlemen only." He lists 422 colleges and universities as of 1879. Here are some sample enrollments: Columbia College, 458 students; Dartmouth, 281 students; Yale, 753; Tufts, 74; Kenyon, 40; University of Michigan, 425; Northwestern, 191; University of Chicago, 101; University of California, 320. In our time, the University of California, with its total over-all enrollment of 44,000 students in 1949, had 9,000 more students than all of the state universities in 1899.

These contrasts serve to sharpen what has happened in American education and to indicate the inevitability of problems under the amazing development which has taken place. Whatever may be the sum total of the reasons

for the remarkable growth of education in this country there is, of course, that unquestionably far-reaching American passion for a chance at indefinite perfectibility, joined with a powerful belief in equalitarianism, and a conviction that those who don't achieve suffer from a disability which ought to be removed. Obviously enough, the typical American would seem to believe that education is the instrument for the removal of such disabilities. What these concepts have done to promote education, and to validate it, is almost beyond computation. It is the better part of discretion, no doubt, to recall this point of view when the entrance problems and enrollment growth of schools and colleges are being considered.

That a higher percentage of youth in the near future will be graduated from secondary schools, and will clamor for college acceptance is reasonably certain. If the problems created by larger enrollments seem overwhelming today, they will continue so to be unless schools and colleges together make more comprehensive and zealous efforts to reach solutions.

EXPLORING ADJUSTMENT

Schools and colleges, it seems, could and should do far more to explore the possibilities of adjustment between the last year of the secondary school and the first year of college, whether it be at the twelfth or the fourteenth grade level.

Perhaps a double-barreled continuity is an answer to the dilemmas created by increased enrollment and an expanding curriculum. A continuity, first of all, in general education and, secondly, in desirable preparation for and sequence in advanced studies. The assumption is that to achieve workably satisfactory continuities of such design, schools and colleges would need to work together far more closely than has been the custom. This would seem to presuppose a major reorganization of the lower and upper two-year divisions of the colleges, with the lower division especially geared to the last two years of the secondary school. Thus might there be the new continuity of general education in replacement of

the now lost continuity of the seven liberal arts.

Naturally, relationships between schools and colleges are affected by changes other than enrollment growth. Secondary school teachers and leaders are likely to think that because their schools are nearer the people, there is a keener sensitivity to a changing society. Whatever may have been a difference in this respect in past years, it is much less true at the moment. Modern communication plus the growing expectations of the people are fast bringing all educational institutions into the arena of active public life.

III

A part of our assignment was to indicate something of the school's attitude toward the colleges. Obviously, whatever may be quickly presented, as must necessarily be the case, will be one-sided or but partially true. For every negative point there is something to be said affirmatively.

May we say that our purpose is to sharpen issues, needs, and items which would seem to require further exploration and concerted action.

A moment ago, we stated that schools think themselves to be more responsive to changes in American life than are the higher institutions. Such response, the schools affirm, is basic to their curriculum problems. Consequently, the schools think that colleges should offer more understanding of and more concern about such changes, and what these changes have done to American life. Time will allow just two quick examples.

There were 4,000 automobiles in 1900. Now there are enough cars and trucks for each pupil or student from the kindergarten through the university to ride to school in a separate vehicle, and such usage would leave 24,000,000 vehicles for the use of those who do not go to school.

In 1900, our society was dominantly agrarian. Today it is about 60 per cent urban and some of our once-great agricultural states—Ohio, for example—are nearly 70 per cent urbanized. Nationally, only about 15 per cent of the labor

classification is at present in agricultural work.

That these stupendous changes have come to the world, local, regional, and national, appears incomprehensible to the isolationist, whether he be such in the milieu of politics, economics, folkways, or education.

Fortunately, there are those whose clarity of vision has brought understanding and whose interpretation has developed faith. Thus, we are afforded the wisdom of the distinguished philosopher, Alfred Whitehead, when he writes:

"Our sociological theories, our political philosophy, our practical maxims of business, our political economy, and our doctrines of education are derived from our unbroken tradition of thinkers and of practical examples from the age of Plato, in the fifth century before Christ, to the end of the last century. The whole of this tradition is warped by the vicious assumption that each generation will substantially live amid the conditions governing the lives of its fathers and will transmit those conditions to mold with equal force the lives of its children. We are living in the first period of human history for which this assumption is false."

Is it too much to imply that our long-time concern to maintain an inherited academic continuity in education has largely contributed to the false assumption as stated by Professor Whitehead?

BRIDGING THE CULTURAL GAP

Many interpreters of the schools and their purposes hold that an antiquated schooling, on the one hand, and the dominating demands of a changing society, on the other, have created the dilemma into which education has been tossed. Until recently, bridging the cultural gap between parents and children has appeared almost too difficult to accomplish. Too often, it seems, the chief critics of the day are still engaged, futilely no doubt, in the widening of this gap.

But most of us in professional education believe that the gap has been narrowed. The school and community movement, the great increase in adult education, the realization of

multiple efforts to establish a new continuity between school and college have all conspired to throw stout bridges across the narrowing gap. It is not amiss to say that there has never been so much ferment in education as exists today, and it is directed toward the new continuity of which we speak, a continuity formed of educational material and method as suitable for the best development of the individual as it is for the common good. Bridges, too, are needed between general studies and specialized courses. This appears to be especially true of professional and preprofessional programs. Schools should be able to do a much better job of preparation for college if the college structure can suggest more synthesis and more purpose. All of this constitutes a sequence far more difficult to arrive at than that afforded by a specified number of stabilized units. But its potentiality in terms of what it may do for people transcends its difficulty of organization and achievement.

PRESCRIBED CURRICULA?

The long-time complaint of the secondary school has been directed against the curricular prescription of college preparatory units. In recent years, there would appear to be considerable evidence that this is something of a worn-out bogey. Hesitant and unrealistic school leaders tend to hide their own complacency and lack of inventiveness behind the so-called restrictions of college entrance requirements. On the other side, many schools think that they are preparing youth for types of college education which are tragically passé.

As a part of this complaint, the schools contend that the colleges are too slow in recognition of what has been learned about the factors of significance for college success other than curricular prescription. They affirm that continuously, since the studies of Bancroft Beatley in the early 1920's, evidence has been piling up in support of the point that exactitude in units of subject matter is relatively unimportant.

Possibly it is the problem created by the social prestige of the courses listed as college prepara-

tory which irritates the schools most of all. There is proof enough that the factor of social prestige distorts and nullifies the best of the guidance practices and much too often prevents, in the public schools, the building of a properly balanced curriculum.

IV

It has been said often enough that preparation for college is not necessarily the same as preparation for college entrance. The schools will forthrightly proclaim that it is their obligation to prepare students for advanced studies and thus to lay the groundwork for sequential specialization. The schools assert, honestly enough, their interest in quality production. Schools do not object to selection for college which is fairly based on qualities which are essential for college success.

Much has been said by educational interpreters and by secondary school leaders about the highly selective character of the earlier secondary schools, particularly those of fifty years ago and before. The presumption has been that only the especially able students were enrolled in the days when high schools, for example, were relatively young.

In contrast, our 1879 *Handbook* holds that "quality rather than quantity is the pressing demand of all the colleges; and, while pupils are expected to . . . acquaint themselves with all that is demanded . . . , conditions and rejections are based on poor quality rather than insufficient quantity in preparation.

"Incompetency in instruction and the haste which makes waste, so common among students, are deplorably conspicuous in our preparatory schools, and we would reiterate the thought that if students would render the instruction and opportunities of their college life profitable and pleasant, they will leave no means unemployed to secure the best instruction in their preparatory work . . ."

This problem of quality versus quantity is still with us. Many would affirm that it is a far

greater issue today than it was fifty years ago or earlier. It is now more than a matter of mere quality; it is rather a question of quality to what end, and, identically, for quantity—quantity for what purpose? Surely there is a question of sifting, according to purpose, which neither schools nor colleges have boldly or intelligently faced.

Secondary schools will say generally that, by and large, colleges have steadily improved in qualitative methods of admission, if not in curriculum and instructional techniques. In colleges, especially the independent institutions which have made the wisest use of the aptitude tests, the quality of the entering freshman has improved amazingly. Unfortunately, not enough of the alumni seem to know this fact.

It is not amiss to state that most schools are pleased to be a part of the movement toward quality selection and toward higher standards of scholastic achievement. Wise and extensive use of the achievement tests can make a very notable difference in this respect. Many secondary school leaders are realizing as never before that higher standards of accomplishment are of necessity a part of the ever-widening reaches of scientific and social knowledge, and of the constant process of refinement in techniques, understandings, and applications, and that particularly improvement in the measurement of learning and instruction will more certainly make for accuracy in the testing of individual power and accomplishment.

The schools report that too often colleges are not clear as to the levels of ability necessary for success in college as contrasted with the level required for admission. The schools think that the relationship of college rank and marks is too seldom interpreted on the basis of the average abilities in the secondary school from which the students come. The startling discoveries of the Pennsylvania study of some years ago are now supported by further similar evidence. A recent study in Ohio, for example, discloses that the average intelligence on the basis of general norms of twenty-five colleges in one year ranged

from the twenty-fourth percentile in one institution to the ninety-fifth percentile in another.

Such information would indicate that common instruments of measurement and evaluation may be quite as necessary among colleges as they are among secondary schools, particularly if there is an attempt to adjudicate between quality and quantity. Ideally, school and college counselors could do a better job if information of the character just indicated were at hand.

Schools have long been concerned about receiving the major blame for failures in college. It is known well enough that both parents and college representatives, chiefly alumni, encourage students to enter colleges for which the students are not, in the judgment of the schools, properly fitted.

In this matter of failure, it is increasingly evident that lack of desirable counseling constitutes the weak link. A considerable number of secondary schools believe that a major obstacle in school and college relations at the moment lies in the typically inadequate college follow-up of entering students. This also accounts for a considerable number of failures, especially in the large institutions. There is reason to believe that both schools and colleges do not properly develop the guidance information which is desirable, or do not make good use of that information which is already available. The schools think that the colleges have been slow to gear their guidance practices with their admissions procedures. It is maintained, too, that school guidance is often confused by the lack of articulation between the curricula and the entrance method of the colleges.

In the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges, which represents nineteen states, a recent survey discloses that counseling and guidance as integral to college admission and college success is believed to offer the largest possibility for the improvement of school and college relations.

A cry often heard among the schools concerns the difficulty of getting accurate and detailed information about the programs of individual col-

leges. The point is made that the data which the schools really want is not effectively supplied. There is particular criticism of the college catalog, affirming that it is not a practical instrument for use either by parents or by students.

The 1879 *Handbook* to which we have already referred states: "When students wisely conclude to make a college education their ambition and aim, they very naturally send for one or a dozen college catalogs to ascertain requirements and other information which will enable them to decide which college to enter; but the great mass of facts which these catalogs contain often tends to confuse the mind and to render of little avail the trouble occasioned and the expense incurred."

Not the least of the services of the Board has been, in the judgment of the schools, its peculiarly effective *Handbook*, and we learn with pleasure that recently made plans will cause this document to be even more specifically directed to student usage.

V

These few critical points, which we have attempted merely to suggest, serve only to bring to mind the steady progress already made in the relationship between schools and colleges, and to indicate areas for future planning and action. In the judgment of the speaker, the regional associations and the College Entrance Examination Board have been by all odds the agencies most instrumental in the progress of which we speak.

Now that the Board's membership has so largely increased and in the light of the ever-growing interest of both schools and colleges in an extended use of the Board's services, there is high promise that this organization will afford more than ever before significant media for constructive relationships among schools, among colleges, and between schools and colleges. Thus it becomes a reasonable hope that cross-purposes, or rather in truth, difficulties which center in common problems, will be further reduced and that a new and ever-strengthening American continuity in education will be built.

The Admissions Process—Barrier or Gate?

John W. Hallowell

John W. Hallowell is well qualified to represent the independent school point of view. He graduated from Milton Academy in 1926 and the next year studied at Phillips Exeter. From 1936 to 1942 he taught English and German at the Groton School. Since 1946 he has been Headmaster of Western Reserve Academy.

Mr. Hallowell is a graduate of Harvard College and the Harvard School of Business. As a Lieutenant Commander in the Navy he was awarded nine battle stars and the Legion of Merit.

This subject, on which President Cole and I have been asked to speak, is a timely one. The colleges are like a range of pasture lands lying beyond another range of pastures which are the schools. As the young stock grows, it must move from one pasture to another, for it needs different grass for its educational nourishment; it needs broader fields to graze upon. Schools and colleges agree that the moving of the stock should be accomplished at the right time, in as smooth and efficient manner as possible, for the healthy growth of the stock should be a continuous process, a passing through gates into the pastures best suited for the feeding of the individual young animals.

Not all the young stock, however, should pass through the gate from one range to another. Not all do, for at the gate or gates stand those who bar the way to some, look with a critical and steely eye on some, and with welcoming smiles to others. Among the farmers on the near side of the gates there has been much careful grooming and selection of those they lead forward to be examined at the gates opening upon those oh-so-green fields beyond. Through long acquaintance with the stockmen at the fence, they have developed a healthy respect for their judgment, and for their ability to appraise the qualities of the

stock fairly and rapidly. On the whole they are pretty well satisfied with the process.

In other words, the schools recognize the general rightness of the admission criteria used by the colleges. They are, of course, just as interested as the colleges in the best selection of candidates, and in the wise guiding of those candidates to the colleges where they will experience profitable, enjoyable, successful higher education. All the colleges use much the same criteria in judging the rightness and fitness of the candidates to be admitted. These include, as we all know, the school record and diploma, scholastic aptitude and achievement as measured by tests, and qualities of character and personality, particularly as they indicate promise of contributing to the life of a college. Other criteria, as ability to meet college expenses, claims on special scholarship funds, priorities based on alumni affiliation, religious faith, place of residence, etc., are not found unreasonable by the schools as a whole.

SCHOOLS ACCEPT SELECTION CRITERIA

It is not with the criteria then, that the schools find fault. They accept them. It is my opportunity, however, this morning, to express as best I can what the schools do find fault with in this admissions process, and to suggest an idea or two which may be useful in improving it. Much as the schools may agree with the rightness of the criteria, they have a number of justifiable complaints about their *use*. Perhaps the very fact that apparently the same criteria are used so differently by different colleges, in different parts of the country, and at different times, is our one chief complaint.

Let us look again for a moment at the criteria themselves.

These may be divided into the *objective*, measurable factors and the more *subjective*

factors, incapable of being measured accurately.

The objective factors are, of course, the school record, rank in class, and College Board or other test scores. There are certainly very great differences in the ways these are considered by the colleges. Some refuse admission to candidates with low rank in class; some draw rather arbitrary lines on test scores, rejecting candidates who do not achieve a minimum figure. To the schools such practices seem reasonable, but frequently they do not know just where these lines are drawn nor why. Nor do they always understand how much weight a college may put on one or the other factor in coming to a decision about a candidate's fitness.

USE OF SUBJECTIVE CRITERIA

It is not by the use of the objective, more measurable factors, however, that the schools feel most often baffled. They know that the colleges also place weight on those subjective criteria—qualities of personality, character, citizenship, etc., which can be checked on scales of some sort. I believe the schools feel these rating scales have very limited value. As far as they can see, the colleges don't make much use of them.

The most important part of the attempt to estimate a candidate's qualities of character and personality is what is generally called the Principal's Report. Here is requested a frank statement of the candidate's fitness and promise. If the colleges would pay more attention to this part of the admissions papers, the schools would feel much happier. After all, who should know best the character of a candidate if not those who have lived and dealt intimately with him in school over a period of time? Too often there is the feeling that a brief interview by an admissions officer, or the recommendation of an alumni committee or interested coach is given more weight than the careful and considered estimate written by the school faculty, guidance officer, or principal. Certainly as valuable a criterion of college readiness and fitness as scholastic aptitude is the determination to succeed,

or the industriousness to achieve success. A candidate's teachers know this better than anyone else.

BURDEN OF PAPER WORK

What are some of the other grievances? Chief among these is the enormous amount of paper work caused by the great variety and complexity of application forms. In any school with a considerable number of college candidates, merely the time and study necessary to fill out these forms is a great burden. This has been particularly heavy in recent years when the competition for entrance to many colleges has been so severe. It is not uncommon for a school with 100 college candidates to fill out 300 or more sets of application papers. To do such a job conscientiously and accurately is time-consuming at best. Schools have sometimes hired special people to do the job, as neither the principal nor any teacher with teaching duties could find the necessary time.

There is a very considerable period, also, between the filing of application papers, the taking of entrance tests, and the final report on admission or rejection from the colleges themselves. These delays in handling of papers, inevitable as they may be in the existing process, have a very unsettling effect on the candidates themselves. This is particularly true when rejection results.

Until it was abandoned yesterday, the College Board choice rule was a part of the process which the schools found particularly annoying, and not merely because it was one of the reasons why several sets of papers had to be prepared and filed for a given candidate.

CONCEALED FACTORS

In many instances schools feel there are concealed discriminations and priorities exercised by college admissions officers which, in many cases, work unfairnesses on the boys and girls. The schools do recognize that state-supported colleges are obliged to give priority to in-state residents; that colleges desiring nationally representative student bodies have justifiable re-

gional quotas; that colleges with religious foundations have the right to give priority to those of similar religious affiliation; and that the program of a given college requires that greater weight be given to verbal or mathematical aptitude; yet the schools feel that the best interests of the candidates themselves, and hence of both the schools and the colleges, might well be better served if the admission criteria were administered in favor of the obvious desire of a college to attract and admit that group of candidates adequate by nature and training to its particular program and life. Is the end served, the schools ask, when they observe, or think they do, priorities given to alumni sons less well-qualified than others; when single first-choice candidates are accepted before equally good double or triple first-choices, or over better second-choice candidates; when undue favor is given because of athletic promise; when candidates from "good customer" schools get the nod over others; when the "wire-pulling" activities of alumni, friends of the family, coaches, fraternity representatives, and others with special interests seem to outweigh the school's recommendation?

Undoubtedly there are other faults to be found, or criticisms to be made by the schools, of the way the admissions process works. I have only attempted to run through some of the most obvious. Criticisms and findings of fault are of little value, however, if they do not lead to constructive suggestions.

PRINCIPAL'S RECOMMENDATION

High on a list of these is the request that the colleges place greater reliance on the school's recommendation. If the colleges would insist on carefully prepared and honest estimates, the schools, all schools, will prepare them. They will be carefully written and honest estimates if the colleges make it very clear that they place great value on them. They will, in many instances, continue to be hastily written if the feeling persists that many colleges do not give them much weight. A generation ago, in the early years of

the College Board, a school presenting a candidate for Board examinations was asked to state one of three things. Did the school *recommend* the candidate for examination, did it *consent* to his taking the examination, or was the candidate taking the examination *on his own*? If the present school estimates were to conclude with similar statements as to a candidate's application to college, wouldn't the admissions officer have a most useful, if not the most useful, piece of information he could ask for?

COLLEGE PERFORMANCE

A second suggestion is that colleges pay greater attention to the college performance of graduates from a given school. Perhaps this is not possible in all instances, but there is available for a large number of schools the reports of the National Registration Office. These were originally prepared by the College Board itself. They give good indications of how graduates of a given school perform in all the colleges to which they send graduates, and can be extremely helpful to admissions men who are considering, for the first time, candidates from schools unknown to them.

EXPLAINING THE COLLEGES

A third suggestion is that the individual colleges do a better job of explaining their colleges, their programs, and campus life to the schools. Although college catalogs and publications have in many instances improved greatly in recent years, there is still much room for further improvement. College representatives and admissions officers who visit schools could in many instances be selected with more care. The schools note with satisfaction that many of the recently appointed college admission directors are men from the schools themselves, or men with wide school experience. Good publicity movies help candidates immensely in getting a balanced picture of the life and opportunities at a given college. Schools are glad to show them. Most helpful to the schools would be bulletins describing the character of the freshman class

admitted the previous year. A small but increasing number of colleges now put out such bulletins, in which the make-up of their freshman classes is described in terms of rank-in-class, I. Q., College Board test results, percentage of public and independent school enrollment, regional representation, and other pertinent information. For us in the schools such bulletins are invaluable in our guidance work.

Further suggestions include the reducing of emphasis on alumni affiliations and of athletic prowess for its own sake, and the elimination of the influence of special pressure groups.

Agree on a greater uniformity of acceptance dates, and on the practice of asking for fees to nail down acceptances.

Build closer acquaintance and cooperation between admissions officers and the schools. Give us in the schools adequate explanations for rejections, when they occur. It will help us in guiding the next year's candidates more wisely, and it will do you in the colleges no harm from a public relations viewpoint. We want specific reasons to give to candidates and their disappointed parents, not vague generalizations likely to be interpreted to the colleges' disadvantage.

The suggestions just given may seem to cover too much of the waterfront. They have not mentioned the function or position of the College Board very specifically. Yet here we have the Board, a growing organization, more national in scope than any other of its kind, existing to serve its members and customers. It stands as a foremost agent in this process of transition from school to college. It serves the needs of its users in that it builds, administers, scores, and reports the results of tests. It is primarily a testing agency. As such the schools have a very real and sincere respect for it.

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE BOARD

But are there not greater services than testing which the College Board could perform for its users? Is there not an opportunity for the Board to expand and widen its usefulness? Let us return for a moment to the metaphor suggested by

the title of these remarks — The Admissions Process, Barrier or Gate?

The present process is not a barrier. It is more like a gate leading from the school pasture into a field where paths lead off in a number of directions. The boy or girl having the qualifications to pass through the gate often does not know where these paths lead. He or she wants to take the one leading to the college of his or her choice, or finding that barred, the path leading to the second-choice college. Too often those at the gate cannot tell him where these paths lead, nor was he, when back in pasture, always able to find out.

CLEARING HOUSE FOR CREDENTIALS

Could the gate from the school pasture lead to a sorting-pen, admitting those fit to go to the college fields beyond, barring those unfit? If so, there could be several gates on the college-field side of the sorting-pen, from which the college farmers could select the particular stock they wanted and found suited for the grazing conditions in their individual fields. In other words, if the metaphor hasn't become too confused, could not the College Board become this sorting-pen, a clearing house for the papers and credentials of all the candidates? It now serves as an agent at the gate, examining those who wish to pass through and reporting to the potential buyers its findings on certain qualities of the animals. Could it not serve the college buyers and the school breeders, as well as the animals themselves, if it served as clearing-house clerk as well as appraising agent?

If all, or almost all, the pertinent information about each candidate could be gathered on a uniform or standard form of three or four pages, and if this could be prepared carefully, accurately, and for each candidate only *once*, it could be gathered at the clearing house, photostated, and made available to each college in which the candidate expresses interest, in the order in which he desires.

Among the advantages of such a central clearing house would be:

1. A great reduction in the amount of paper work done by the schools; the elimination of much unnecessary duplication of time and effort now caused by the variety of forms.
2. Greater care in preparation of application papers by school and candidate.
3. Greater efficiency in handling of these papers by the colleges, and consequently fewer delays.
4. There would be immediately available for many colleges the basic information on many thousands of candidates who must necessarily be rejected by colleges of their first choice; rejected, that is, not for lack of fitness or promise, but because such colleges simply cannot accommodate all the qualified candidates who apply.

Perhaps an example may show how such a clearing house would benefit many colleges and candidates. Joe Doaks is a good candidate, but is rejected at College "A" on a fair selective basis. Colleges "B" and "C," his second and third choices, would like to accept Joe, but often learn, under the present process, of his rejection at "A" too late. If "B" and "C" could know within a few days after College "A" reaches its decision, they would immediately have available at the clearing house all the basic information on Joe *and* all the other candidates rejected at their first-choice colleges. They could consider Joe and these others on a fair, selective basis, and could thus complete their enrollments with the best candidates available.

To look at it another way, Joe would file his college application with this central clearing house. He would ask that photostat copy #1 be forwarded to College "A," his first choice. If College "A" accepts Joe, all is hunky-dory. If College "A" rejects Joe, he or his school could immediately ask that photostat #2 be forwarded to "B." If rejected at "B" also, photostat #3 could be sent with a minimum of delay to College "C."

Such a sorting-pen or clearing-house system

would encourage schools and candidates to come to firmer decisions about which college Joe wants to go to, and can probably be accepted at. After all he can only go to one college in the end. College "A" would have the advantage of knowing which candidates really want to come to College "A"; and in the event that the number of these first-choice qualified candidates were not enough to fill its freshman class, it could exercise better selection in choosing from the "pool" because the information would be currently available in standard form.

I fully realize that there are many unthought-of and unthought-through details in connection with such a proposal as this, but it is submitted as an idea worthy of consideration. The College Board seems the logical organization to provide such a service. It is growing rapidly as a testing agency. There is need for an agency to bring more efficiency into the admissions process, lest the value of the services the Board now performs be decreased or lost in a complexity of paper work, red tape, and a growing confusion about the use of agreed-upon criteria.

A GATE FOR SORTING, NOT A BARRIER FOR EXCLUDING

What we all want of the admissions process is that it be a gate used for sorting, not a barrier for excluding. There is a song sung at President Cole's college, two verses of which run as follows:

We have climbed together up the pathway,
On to the goal where life doth wait;
Where in bright and beckoning fields of promise
Lieth fame or fate.

So enter that daily thou mayest grow
In knowledge, wisdom, and love.
So depart that daily thou may'st better serve
Thy fellowman, country, and God.

If our boys and girls can sing such thoughts after passing through the admissions gate, they will have been well-guided, well-tested, and well-selected. It is our duty and our opportunity to make that process such a gate.

College Admissions—Progress and Problems

Charles W. Cole

Charles W. Cole graduated from Amherst College in 1927. In 1946 he returned to become its President. An economic historian, he spent the intervening years teaching economics at Amherst and history at Columbia. During the war he served the government in the Office of Price Administration.

As a member of the admissions committee at Amherst College, Dr. Cole has taken a keen interest in the identification and selection of talented students.

In fifty years the function and the very examinations of the College Board have undergone a remarkable evolution. When I made my first acquaintance with this organization at the bottom by taking its French and plane geometry examinations in the spring of 1921, the various tests covered specifically designated material. In Latin, for example, they were based on certain books of Caesar, certain orations of Cicero, and certain portions of Vergil. In English, I remember vividly that *Silas Marner* was required reading, and had it not been, I think I might some day have grown to like George Eliot.

It could be, and was freely alleged, that the College Board was constricting secondary school curricula and restricting experiment. But, already for some years it had been moving toward comprehensive and less specific examinations. Then the direction changed sharply and, in the 1930's, we turned to the objective type of test both for aptitudes and for achievement.

The impact of World War II brought this about rapidly. This last shift was both motivated by and accompanied by significant developments in statistical and testing procedures, which permitted a fairly rigorous determination of the reliability and validity of the tests and created a better understanding of the meaning and limitations of the test results. Today, as has been pointed out, many admissions officers look

harder at the aptitude than at the achievement scores. Some colleges at least will admit a student who stood high in his class at school, is recommended by the school authorities, has promising aptitude scores, and presents three years of mathematics. Women's colleges will often waive the third year of mathematics. The College Board examinations no longer constitute the framework of a Procrustean bed on which the curriculum of each school must willy-nilly lie, but rather they do represent an attempt to evaluate in usable terms the student's capacity for college work and his school experience to date—whatever it may have been.

I think it can be said that there are certain signs of the pendulum swinging, for I have heard school people in the last two or three years frequently say that they wished the College Board gave a little more guidance on subject-matter coverage in certain areas. We may find a reversion in that direction, though there are certain difficulties in the way.

Today we might well confine ourselves to a celebration of the progress made in a half century, to pious remembrances of the founders, and to an enumeration of the milestones we have passed. But it has always been characteristic of the College Board to challenge the future rather than to commemorate the past. It seems more appropriate, therefore, critically to examine the achievement of the present and to cast a glance along the road ahead.

In the area of mechanics, the present-day status is impressive. The number of tests given, the efficiency of administration, the accuracy of scoring, the speed of reporting, are all indications of a tremendously effective system. But the end is clearly not yet, and it would be my guess that, along the lines which Mr. Hallowell has just suggested, there remains a tremendous opportunity for the College Board to become, in a sense, a Central Transcript Office, serving the

schools and the colleges, and preventing candidates and schools from bogging down in a morass of paper.

There are obvious difficulties in the suggestion, and the one that would be raised first, I think, would be the fact that many principals and headmasters have very confidential and firm relationships with the colleges, and would give information to a college which they would not like to send to a Central Transcript Office. I do not think that this objection is overriding, however, because they could send to the Central Transcript Office information that they felt appropriate and communicate by other means—verbally, on the telephone, by letter—with the colleges to which they wish to give added confidential information. And I do think that a Central Transcript Office would produce a better sorting between the pastures than we have now, and with more efficiency and less effort. Along these lines or others, we may anticipate that in the coming years the College Board will improve its service and simplify the procedures of transforming school seniors into college freshmen and distributing the warm and quivering bodies among the various colleges.

PROBLEMS OF PREDICTION

As to the tests themselves today, it can be said that when the scores are carefully used in conjunction with school records and recommendations, predictions of performance in the freshman year may be arrived at which will often show coefficients of correlation in the high 60's when compared with the actual performance of the first college year. Predictions of total performance in college based on test scores are not nearly so accurate. But it must be remembered that the further a student goes beyond the first term in college, the more he is removed from the candidate who was tested for entrance, and the more he is shaped and influenced by the college environment itself.

I have heard many faculty members at various colleges complaining about the admissions process, and blaming their ills upon it, when

actually it would be more appropriate to examine what was done with the student when he arrived, how he was guided, counseled, and taught, because certainly by sophomore year, and even more clearly in the upperclass years, the student is as much a product of the college itself as of the school from which he came, or of the admission procedure by which he was admitted.

Public and professional confidence in aptitude tests, arising in part at least from those developed by the College Board, has risen to such a point that it seems likely that scores on a general aptitude test will be a major factor in determining which college students will be deferred under the Selective Service Act, that is, if those to whom we have a right to look for leadership in the educational world, with a remarkable lack of faith in education, do not propose and support a system which would permit no deferment of college students. Within the colleges, admissions officers and deans have long been using College Board scores, often in comparison with classroom achievement, to single out underperformers for special attention and guidance.

When this has been said about aptitude tests, however, I think we should all remember that just as we learned that intelligence tests did not test intelligence, because there was no abstract entity "intelligence" in the individual to test, so I think we should beware of thinking that scholastic aptitude really exists and is not merely a name we give to some operations we do. Actually, of course, I think the psychologists will tell us that we are not testing any entity called scholastic aptitude, but rather we are testing the total response of the whole individual to certain given situations, and that from this sampling of responses we try to draw conclusions about future responses of the individual.

College admission, despite the improvement in the aptitude test, is still an art and not a science, and its practitioners must be artful, if not artistic. But it is infinitely more scientific, more just, more accurate than it was thirty, or even fifteen years ago.

After congratulating ourselves on progress

made, it might not be amiss to look at some of the problems still demanding solution. One general development may lead to a basic improvement, and it makes me just a shade optimistic about the problems that our first two speakers were addressing themselves to. In the first forty years of this century, there was a growing split or division between school and college work which no entrance procedures could adequately bridge. In the colleges, there was a tremendous multiplication of courses at the same time that an unrestricted elective system was gaining ever-greater ascendancy. In the secondary schools, as they rapidly accepted increasing numbers of students from all levels of society, there was a trend toward vocational courses—some would call it dilution—on the one hand, and a general broadening of the curriculum combined with progressive techniques on the other. Thus it could easily happen, and often did, and still does, that a college freshman might have no course which in approach, method, or subject matter represented a continuation of his school work.

TREND TOWARD GENERAL EDUCATION

Since the war, there has been a widespread tendency to follow lines (probably first developed and explored at Columbia College) toward what we now call general education, and I would agree that it is the last bulwark of learning in certain broad senses. At the same time, there has been in many institutions a drastic reduction in the range of free elections in the first two college years. A parallel trend may be becoming visible in some schools—in a few because they never abandoned the core curriculum; in others, because it is being recreated out of a welter of conflicting opportunities. To a rapprochement in subject matter, there might be added one in technique and method. This actually seems to be happening as the schools lop off some of the methodological experiments and vagaries and the colleges at long last discover the improvement in teaching techniques that have been developed since 1900. If this trend is a

real one, and if the colleges and schools do come closer to a meeting of subject matter and method, then the task of the College Board will become easier for it will not be trying to build a bridge across an unbridgeable chasm.

There are two other areas where it seems to me that there is hope for improvement in college admissions, though the difficulties are simply immense. One is the matter of motivation, to which I will revert in a moment. The second is what I call to myself the problem of the "late bloomer."

We all know the type to which I refer by this phrase. Not long ago, I had the privilege of conferring an honorary degree on a man of forty-five who, in the face of great obstacles, had achieved the highest distinction in medical research, teaching, and administration. His high school record was mediocre. In college, he had only two or three marks above a very dull "C" level. He bloomed late, it happened, because in school and college he was too interested in athletics.

I recently looked up the college records of three famous Amherst alumni. Dwight Morrow entered with conditions, and Chief Justice Stone under unusual circumstances, which I will not go into. Both stood consistently at the top of their classes. With Calvin Coolidge, on the other hand, the bud did not even begin to open until after college. His four-year college average was 78.71. In another case I recently checked, there were no signs of flowering before college, but a petal or two did begin to appear in the senior year. The man came to Amherst as a sophomore. That year he made an average of 72.60. As a junior, his average was 79.85, and for his senior year it was 83.40, but before he was thirty-five, he was head of a most important government agency, and today, still under forty, he is executive vice-president of a great corporation.

I think, too, of a little, unobtrusive, undistinguished man I knew in college, who has hewed out for himself a magnificent career in rural public health. Or, of a man I knew who

flunked out of college his sophomore year, returned only to be suspended on a disciplinary matter his junior year, returned once again and graduated. He stood almost at the top of his class in law school, and is today a leading attorney in New York City.

I could go on with illustrations of this sort by the score, and so could each one of you. One of the joys of a career in education is its surprises, and of these the most pleasant are the boys and girls who attain unexpected heights.

It seems to be a fact that some people reach their peak performance in secondary school, others in college, others in graduate school, and still others only in their thirties or forties. It seems also that many of these "late bloomers" make contributions of the highest order and significance to society.

It seems to me this phenomenon should impel us to ask some questions, namely:

Have we squarely faced the fact that intellectual and moral maturity is probably attained at even more widely varying ages than is physical maturity?

Does not the whole college admission system at present favor those who achieve maturity early, or to ask it another way, do we not put a premium on precocity?

How can we detect the candidate who has within him the potentiality for further growth? How can we distinguish him from the young man who has already developed as far as he ever will?

"LATE BLOOMERS"

To my knowledge, these matters have not been made the subject of extensive research. Today we have no mechanism for finding these "late bloomers" save the hunch of the admissions officer. We may be picking the flowers that, already full-blown, will wither soon, and ignoring the buds that promise better for the future. It does not seem to me impossible that a study could be made in which some hundreds of "late bloomers" might be isolated and their school and college careers examined for common characteristics. We might find that there were

signs which, if recognized, would elevate another phase of admissions beyond the guesswork level.

Another, and a not wholly unrelated area, is that of motivation—the student's own eagerness to make the most of his school and college opportunity. The first class I ever taught was one in which the students had been carefully selected and each had an I.Q. of over 126. The delight and excitement of that class, as compared with some later ones in which I struggled with the laggards in the back row, led me to a conviction that innate ability to do college work was the overriding, if not the only, desideratum. A college composed wholly of students capable of doing the work set them would, I thought, be a sort of academic paradise. Since the war, many colleges have been in approximately that position, and, if improvements have been notable, still the teachers' Elysium is not yet.

Years of experience, teaching contact with hundreds of students, and an opportunity to examine a wide variety of records have convinced me that motivation is to be weighed about equally with innate ability and the adequacy of preparation. Yet, motivation is a most delicate growth. It burgeons often in the most unlikely places, and languishes often under the most favorable circumstances. It can be killed by trouble at home, by associates at school or at college, or by some extracurricular diversion, or by a bout of adolescent love.

With motivation, marvels can be achieved. I remember a student who had in freshman year—the passing mark being 60—performed the rather unusual feat of passing all his courses with an average of 62. He failed in my sophomore course. To graduate, he needed a 70 average. Mathematically, the odds seemed 100 to 1 against him, so I called him in and talked as persuasively as I could about interesting careers for which an A.B. was not a requisite. He gritted his teeth and told me that he was going to make up the delinquency, get a 76 average for his last two years, and win a diploma. To my immense surprise he did. Three years later he was a war hero. Today at Amherst a prize bears his name.

Related - 2

It is the other type—the underachiever—that presents the more difficult problem. He is the able lad who drifts through college, passes his courses, and enjoys the life around him, but never acquires the training, skills, discipline, insights, or interests that education should give.

There is, too, the half-achiever, who, with great gifts, makes only a respectable record of development and is like a six-cylinder engine sputtering along because the ignition system is not functioning in two of the cylinders.

EVALUATION OF MOTIVATION

How can we evaluate motivation? We are in the position of a football coach compelled to pick his team from the results of a football aptitude examination. I am sure that such could be devised on the basis of tests in blocking, tackling, passing, kicking, and running. It would probably predict with a coefficient of correlation of .65 what boys would make the team in any case. But the coach would not know when he made his selection who had the drive, the enthusiasm, the competitive spirit, the willingness to give the extra effort in the clutch. He would, therefore, make the same sort of mistakes that we do in admission. He would leave off the team the bright, awkward, little fellow who might have been the sparkplug. He might put in the hulking lout who would never keep training and would fail in every crisis.

I have wondered sometimes whether indications of motivation might not be found in the biographical background of the candidate—whether, for example, motivation might not be discovered to vary inversely with the father's income and directly with participation in extra-curricular activities. But the exceptions are so striking and so numerous as to raise grave doubts as to the usefulness of the idea in actual practice.

A recent ETS investigation does show that to have one or both parents foreign born, to be the youngest child, to come from an urban area, to have held school officerships, and to have engaged in social and civic activities outside school, are all positive indicators of scholastic achieve-

ment in college. But the correlations are low, and the interpretation of the data is difficult.

The sheer number of books, other than comic books, read in the three years preceding college might be an indication of scholastic purposiveness. There is too, perhaps, some hope that interest tests will be developed which will predict college and even graduate work with accuracy, but such tests may be testing the same things as aptitude tests and may give only feeble and indirect indications as to motivation.

Again, it may be possible, by studies of over-achievers and underachievers, to find some common characteristics. But what is most needed is some direct approach to the problem of motivation. If we could test or determine motivation even two-thirds as well as we test scholastic aptitude, then we could eliminate a major source of errors in admission, though there would remain those whose level of motivation changes in college, and possibly these constitute a large fraction of my "late bloomers."

If we could detect the undermotivated at admission, we might even be able to develop teaching, advising, and guidance techniques which would instill motivation when it was lacking and increase it when it was rudimentary.

FIELDS YET TO CONQUER

There are many fields, then, for the College Board yet to conquer in its second half-century. We can look forward, perhaps, to a day when still more efficient entrance examinations are a door from one room to another similar one and not a precarious bridge across a gap, to a day when we can with accuracy pluck the "late bloomers," to a day when matters of motivation will not greatly skew our forecasts based on aptitude, to a day when we will, in short, achieve greater insight, accuracy, and justice in the crucial and fantastically difficult process by which an educator seeks to predict the development of a young member of our species. But I doubt deeply if we can ever reduce admissions to a punch-card procedure for all mankind, and not merely half of it is *varium et mutabile*.

Board Publications

Annual Report of the Director, 1949. Description of Board activities, lists of members, examiners, readers. Contains a new section, "Data for Interpreting the Tests." 84 pages. \$.50.

Bulletin of Information and Sample Tests. Advice to candidates and parents, dates of examinations, registration and fees, description of tests, sample questions. 56 pages. Free.

College Board Review. News and research of the College Entrance Examination Board. Subscription: one year, \$.50; two years, \$1. Hard-covered, looseleaf binders for the *Review* stamped in gold leaf are available at cost, \$2.

Handbook, 1949, and Supplement, 1950. Terms of admission to the member colleges. 296 pages (*Handbook*), 112 pages (*Supplement*). \$1.50.

The College Board, Its First Fifty Years. By Claude M. Fuess. "The full story of the College Entrance Examination Board's contribution to twentieth-century education in America." Published by Columbia University Press, New York, 1950. 224 pages. \$2.75.

School Lists. Mimeographed lists of public and independent secondary schools sending an appreciable number of candidates to the Board's examinations. 9 pages. Free.

Order from the Secretary, College Entrance Examination Board, 425 West 117 Street, New York 27, N. Y.

Dates, Tests, Fees: 1951

EXAMINATION DATES

March 10, 1951
May 19, 1951
August 15, 1951
December 1, 1951

EXAMINATION PROGRAMS*

Morning Program

Scholastic Aptitude Test
(Verbal Section)
(Mathematical Section)

Afternoon Program

Achievement Tests

(a maximum of three afternoon tests)

English Composition	Spanish Reading
Social Studies	Biology
French Reading	Chemistry
German Reading	Physics
Greek Reading	Intermediate
(March only)	Mathematics
Italian Reading	Advanced
(March only)	Mathematics
Latin Reading	

Aptitude Tests

Pre-Engineering Science Comprehension
Spatial Relations

EXAMINATION FEES

Morning Program and	
Afternoon Program	\$12
Morning Program only	6
Afternoon Program only	8

* The College Transfer Test, for students transferring from one college to another, is offered on the same dates and at the same centers as the College Entrance Tests. It is administered in the morning. The fee is \$6. *Bulletins of Information* and application blanks for the College Transfer Test will be sent upon request. Address the College Entrance Examination Board, Box 592, Princeton, N. J., or Box 9896, Los Feliz Station, Los Angeles 27, Cal.

